

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow. Applicants respectfully request that the foregoing amendments be entered at least because they narrow the issues for Appeal, and do not raise any new issues requiring further search or consideration.

Claim 9 is currently being amended. Claims 1-11 remain pending in this application.

Claim objections

Claim 9 was objected to for minor informalities. Claim 9 is being amended as suggested in the Office Action thereby overcoming the objection thereto.

Allowable subject matter

Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 9-11 contain allowable subject matter. Claim 9 has been amended to be in independent form, and thus is in *prima facie* condition for allowance. Claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 9, and are thus likewise in *prima facie* condition for allowance.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,700,131 to Miller (“Miller”). Claims 5-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller in view of alleged applicants admitted prior art (specification on pages 1-3) (“AAPA”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a sensor device comprising “a coated electric wire wound around a detection circuit in a planar manner so as to electrostatically shield the detection circuit, wherein the electric wire is coated with an insulating material.” By contrast, Miller does not disclose a coated electric wire wound around a detection circuit in a planar manner.

In contrast to claim 1, Miller does not disclose that its shield 30, which the Office Action equates with the coated electric wire of claim 1, comprises coated wire wound in a planar manner. While Miller discloses that the outer portions of its shield may comprise helically wound wire (see col. 3, lines 59-60), the wire in this case would form a shield having a cylindrical shape only, and would not have any planar portion. Miller fails to anticipate claim 1 for at least this reason.

The Office Action states on page 5:

Given a broad interpretation of the word “planar” examiner is of the opinion that the electrostatic shield provided by Miller offers a planar¹ or a smooth surface without any surface imperfections as clearly evidenced by the element 30 shown in Figure 3 by Miller.

and offers definitions for “planar” and “plane” in footnote 1 of: “Planar = lying in a plane; plane = to make smooth or even.”

Applicants submit, however, that the Examiner’s proffered definition of planar and plane do not support the position that the cylindrical shield of Miller has a planar surface portion. Claim 1 recites the term “planar”, not “plane”. Thus, by the Examiner’s proffered definitions, the portions of the shield of Miller must lie in a plane to meet the limitations of claim 1. Clearly, the cylindrical surface is cylindrical and thus does not lie in a plane. The meaning of the verb “plane” offered by the Examiner is immaterial to the language of the present claims which uses the term “planar” not “plane.” Furthermore, the interpretation of the term “planar” offered by the Examiner is inconsistent with understanding of one of skill in the art from whose perspective even broadest reasonable interpretation are considered.

The AAPA fails to cure the deficiencies of Miller.

The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1, from which they ultimately depend, as well as for further patentable features recited therein. For example, claim 3 recites “a detection circuit board having the detection circuit;

and a cylindrical case; wherein the coated electric wire is wound around the detection circuit board in a cylindrical manner so as to form a cylindrical surface, and the direction of an axis of the cylindrical surface is parallel to the direction of the axis of the case.” By contrast, element 57 of Miller, which the Office Action equates with the circuit board of claim 3 is a bobbin, not a circuit board.

Moreover, presuming for the sake of argument that the bobbin 57 of Miller could be considered to be a circuit board (which it is not), Miller still does not suggest the features of claim 3. The bobbin 57 of Miller has an opening 64 for receiving the shield 30 (col. 4, lines 19-21), which the Office Action equates with the coated wire as recited. Thus, any wiring of the shield 30 would be within the bobbin, not wound around a circuit board as in claim 3.

The Office Action on page 6 states that a bobbin by definition is a cylinder over which wire (thread) is wound. This statement misses the point. While Miller discloses as shown in FIG. 5A that the conductors 21-23 are arranged around the bobbin 57, Miller does not disclose that the shield 30 is arranged around the bobbin 57. Miller specifically discloses “Where the bobbin 57 is used, a central opening 64 is provided for receiving the Faraday shield 30 and the coils 42 and 43.” (col. 4, lines 19-21). Thus, Miller discloses that the shield is within the central opening 64 of the bobbin 57, not wound around the bobbin.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to

Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date July 18, 2006

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Thomas G. Bilodeau

William T. Ellis
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 26,874

Thomas G. Bilodeau
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 43,438